



Author: Prof. Abdolreza Shahrabi Farahani

The Owner of the Philosophy and Theory of Principles of Mechanic Time

The Owner of the Philosophy of Subjective Physics Sciences



Author's Senior Advisor: Prof. Seyed Vahab Mirsalehi

Philosophy of Kant and Nietzsche - Oriental Sciences and Philosophy



Author's Senior Advisor: Dr. Mohammad Reza Zamani Darmazari

Chief of the International Law Commission and Human Rights at UNESCO MIL APAC and WSSPS.UN

The (Subjective Physics Sciences, WSSPS) is a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council since [ECOSOC Special Consultative Status, Since 2023]

Human Rights from the Perspective of Philosophical

Before delving into the topic of human rights from the perspective of philosophical thought, we must understand what kind of being humans are in order to adapt them to the existing laws of human rights and make necessary changes.

Let us begin with the human fetus:

Where does the human fetus grow?

Answer: The fetus is located inside the mother's womb in a safe and bloody fluid called "amniotic fluid," which is inside the amniotic sac.

This fluid is nourished by the mother's blood through the placenta, which has direct contact with the mother's blood. Additionally, the placenta is a tissue that forms from the fetus and has direct contact with the mother's blood.

During the process of pregnancy, the fetus grows and develops inside the womb using the nutrients and oxygen present in the mother's blood, as well as within the amniotic fluid.

Can the fetus continue its life in such a fluid after birth?

Answer: After birth, the fetus can no longer live inside the amniotic fluid.

This fluid serves as a safe and protective environment for the fetus during pregnancy, but after birth, the fetus begins to breathe on its own and seeks the necessary oxygen and nutrients it needs.

The use of amniotic fluid after birth for humans is deadly. Amniotic fluid contains chemical substances that usually occur naturally in the cervical canal due to the fetus's lack of respiration.

This fluid contains skin cells, hair, urine, feces, and chemical substances such as nitrogen, potassium, sodium, and calcium.

If this fluid is swallowed or enters the respiratory system after birth, serious problems can arise and can be fatal for humans.

Therefore, after birth, the fetus cannot live inside the amniotic fluid and must seek its own natural air to breathe.

Explanation: I hope you have understood by now that humans are creatures that live in different times but in the same environment, because humans are essentially beings in temporal dimensions. The fetus receives nutrients, oxygen, and other substances from the mother in this fluid, but is the fetus's mouth closed?

Are the nostrils of the fetus closed? No, they are not.

So, before birth, humans are essentially another creature and after birth, they become another creature.

So, it is not as simple as saying that we know humans and have considered them under the title of human rights, which is exactly when the problem of human rights began, not from a philosophical or ideological perspective, but from a legal perspective.

The issue of the fetus in "temporal dimensions" was first raised by me in 2015.

Humans are not a law that we have included in a law as human rights and we have only looked at it from this perspective.

The fact that I explicitly mentioned in another discussion (Philosophy of Thought) was that it needs to be developed in the educational system in the world, which was the subject, instead of dealing with its nature, it only dealt with its structure and components and forgot about humanity and began to categorize humans by race, skin color, religious beliefs, and so on, which is actually a violation of human rights. Here, it can be said that the law itself has come into conflict with the nature of man and the honesty of human rights has been called into question in its true sense.

I doubt that during the drafting of human rights laws, there was any consideration given to what a human being truly is. However, in general, humans are social creatures and it is necessary for them to live in society. This may seem to simplify the task of writing human rights laws, but it is not that simple.

For instance, how can two individuals living in different societies with different beliefs and traditions have equal rights?

How can an individual living in a tribal and traditional society have equal rights with an individual living in a modern society?

Even in the United States, laws differ from state to state.

How can we write a law for 200 countries with 200 different cultures and languages, and then condemn some of them for not adhering to human rights laws?

The problem lies in the fact that laws have been written not based on human nature but on social rights, without taking into account different cultures, beliefs, behaviors, and, most importantly, the policies of each country. However, we should not worry because human rights laws explicitly state that we must respect each other's cultures and beliefs.

But is this possible?

Should we respect the belief of someone who thinks that killing some people will lead them to a better place (heaven)?

Would it be respectful to a belief that claims laws are one of the products of the emergence of religions, but they themselves benefit from the modern world today?

Similarly, racists also have strong reasons for racism, should we respect them?

Terrorists also have their own beliefs; so should we respect them too?

Dictators also have their own beliefs, so are they also worthy of respect?

Now let's look at society and examine humans in society:

Country X: In Country X, people have a truly democratic system, and everyone lives happily and in an acceptable level of equality.

Now it's time for presidential elections: (The population of Country X is 100 million) We have 4 candidates from 4 different parties for the presidency, and people do not know any of them in terms of personal and social beliefs. Perhaps with the announcement and advertising of the candidates, some limited knowledge can be obtained, but this knowledge does not even reach 5 percent, so all candidates are unknown up to 95 percent.

So far, a real violation of human rights has occurred.

Suppose we choose the best candidate for the presidency, the question arises that can we find a person in politics who does not prioritize their own interests and political party affiliations in decision-making? It is unlikely that such a thing has happened so far.

Then we come to taxes: Suppose a person has an income of \$100,000 per year, and we consider the average tax rate in the world to be 20 percent.

Therefore, the person must pay \$20,000 in taxes.

But where does this money go?

In most countries, in addition to the legitimate costs of the government, a large amount of this money is spent on unnecessary and extravagant expenses of politicians. In conclusion, it can be said

that the world is not as fair as we think it is, and it is the responsibility of all of us to make it a better place to live in.

But how much does it cost to maintain and distribute water in a city that makes water bills so expensive?

Don't people pay taxes all over the world for their governments to provide these services?

There are many examples like this where blatant violations of human rights occur under the guise of law. As I mentioned, human rights cannot be a law but rather a human treaty. If it were a law, it would need to answer the questions posed to the people. At this point, I firmly state that human rights have fundamental violations that require immediate correction.

I saw that the European Union put a country on the list of terrorists and a few months later negotiated with the same group: where were human rights?

I saw that the UN Women's Rights Commission expelled a country from the commission due to gross violations of women's rights, but a few months later invited a representative of that country to speak about human rights: can we trust these human rights based on political laws?

I repeat that the main problem with human rights violations is that they are written by lawyers and politicians without any philosophical or intellectual analysis, or at least I have not seen such important factors in these laws.

I will explain a brief analysis of philosophical laws and human rights, and then I will address the reforms in the articles of human rights laws:

Human rights laws are a set of principles and rules defined to protect the rights and freedoms of every human being worldwide. From a

philosophical perspective, they are examined as one of the ethical and human principles. In fact, philosophy and human rights are two different fields, but from a philosophical perspective, we can discuss the reasons and logic behind human rights laws.

Considering the issue of whether human rights laws are in accordance with human nature or not, two philosophical perspectives can be mentioned:

1. Ethical perspective: This perspective believes that human rights laws are morally correct because they are based on values such as respect for humanity, equality, justice, and freedom. For example, Kant's view can be mentioned in this regard, who believed that every human being has value and respect for their humanity, and therefore, any use of humans as a means to achieve other goals beyond human themselves is inappropriate and undesirable.

2. Corrective perspective: This perspective believes that human rights laws need to be corrected because they may conflict with human values and needs.

For example, Foucault's view in this regard can be mentioned, who believed that human rights laws are based on Western values and need to be changed and corrected to respond to different human needs around the world. Therefore, it can be said that human rights laws are based on human values and ethics in the philosophical perspective and may need to be corrected to respond to different human needs around the world.

Philosophical thinking can be used as a guide for correcting human rights laws. Philosophy, as a field of thought that examines and analyzes ethical, philosophical, political, and social issues, can be effective in correcting human rights laws.

"One of the advantages of using philosophy in improving human rights laws is that philosophy, as a field of thought, delves into the

examination of ethical and human concepts and can serve as a guide in determining the values, foundations, and principles upon which human rights laws are defined.

Philosophy, as a field of thought, examines different aspects and dimensions of human rights laws and their impacts on society and individuals, and can offer effective solutions in determining the direction and strategies for improving human rights laws towards the betterment of human conditions and the preservation of the rights and freedoms of each individual.

Therefore, it can be said that philosophy can be used as a guide for improving human rights laws and can be effective in determining the values, foundations, and principles upon which human rights laws are defined. Human beings are complex individual beings, possessing important features such as will, power, love, anger, thought, creativity, and imagination. As a seemingly conscious being, humans can understand and perceive themselves, and therefore, they have potential responsibility towards themselves and others. As independent and free beings, humans should be able to enjoy their lives and pursue their ideals, and should live as creative and imaginative creators of their own lives.

Regarding gender equality between men and women, it should not be equalized under any circumstances with political slogans such as "gender equality" because men and women are different in various aspects and should be evaluated based on their differences.

Each gender can perform better in certain areas and fields, and there should be no discrimination based on gender.

Instead, it is necessary to provide equal opportunities for both genders to grow and develop according to their interests and abilities, and to create a society in which everyone can live together in peace and harmony, respecting each other's rights and freedoms".

"Let me give you an example: when a female politician returns home, what does she do? Does she engage in political activities, government matters, or does she focus on her household and family?

I'm not trying to belittle the activities of women in any way, and if you pay attention to my words, you will realize that the essence of this issue is about gender equality from a political perspective.

We say that this issue has been examined from a social perspective and has become a law, but I don't see it that way because it is clear that it has been mostly written from a political point of view.

It is true that men and women have the same human nature, but they are completely different in structure and components. It is the structure and components of women and men that determine their behavior, power-seeking tendencies, emotions, and the way they express them.

We don't have the right to consider men and women as equal because considering them equal is a clear violation of human rights, not a respect for them.

If a man or woman says, "I am a feminist," in my opinion, they are simply a gender dictator.

If a man or woman says, "I am a male chauvinist," they are also just a gender dictator.

The fact that women have entered various social, economic, and political activities today due to economic problems (I repeat, due to some problems being forced) is both commendable and criticizable.

We have made all aspects of life difficult with a purely political perspective, which has turned it from a choice into a compulsion.

It is at this point that I say the slogan of gender equality is wrong because it has happened not based on their choice but due to

compulsion, and compulsion itself is a violation of human rights, and governments have caused this contradiction.

If the entry of women into various social fields is a choice, it should be defended completely, but if it is due to compulsion, we should deal with it logically. And where did all these problems and contradictions begin? From where we have mistaken proper education for only academic education".

My overall argument is that when human rights are established within the framework of political laws, and the meaning of being a woman or a man is replaced by "gender equality," it becomes impossible to have an honest conversation about human rights.

Instead, proper education of the new generation is necessary to minimize the mistakes that have occurred in our generation. In this intellectual development, instead of the slogan of gender equality, we should teach everyone to first be themselves and then strive for equality.

I believe that a society is beautiful and just when you see women engaging in various social and political activities not out of compulsion but out of choice and awareness.

This applies to men as well.

We need to do everything we can to use all the intellectual potential on the planet to achieve this beauty in a society. Politics alone is not strategic enough for this important task, and it will require the efforts of philosophers and social workers.

I also believe that the future generation needs to engage in more critical thinking beyond politics.

1. All human beings are born free and equal.

Explanation: Not all human beings are born free for various reasons.

First, they may have been pressured by cultural norms to have children.

Second, the pregnancy may have been unwanted.

Third, the children themselves, who are referred to as humans here, have had no choice in being born, so the phrase "all human beings are born free" is fundamentally flawed.

The same applies to the concept of being noble as it is also a matter of choice, genetics, and culture, and depends on multiple factors that are often beyond human control.

2. All human beings should be equal.

Explanation: Human beings are only equal in their human nature, not in their structure and components.

3. Every human being has the right to life, liberty, and personal security.

Explanation: This law also falls under the same issue of being optional or compulsory. If life, liberty, and security are optional, it is correct; if they are compulsory, it violates human rights.

4. No one shall be subjected to torture or inhuman treatment, nor to trafficking in human beings.

Explanation: Throughout history, humans have always been subjected to torture and inhumane treatment, and even in the modern world, this is still true and in some cases worse. In sports such as football and basketball, humans are easily traded under the name of buying and selling athletes.

Are athletes not human beings?

Actors are the same, and there are other similar cases. We torture humans every day with political issues under the guise of law and politics, so this paragraph of human rights is not respected.

5. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile.

Explanation: Under the guise of "national security," this happens daily. Unfortunately, it is not fully implemented, and this goes back to the same issue I mentioned earlier that human rights are political and often subjective.

6. Everyone has the right to access equal rights under the law everywhere.

Explanation: While I agree that this is a good law, there is a serious discussion that needs to be addressed regarding it.

We say that everyone should have access to a lawyer, but the question arises, don't judges and prosecutors have expertise in criminal laws that give them the right to defend themselves with a lawyer? Doesn't the prosecutor know the law and cannot remove incomplete documents and evidence that accuses a person from the case?

I tried to give a simple explanation, but it could lead to a lengthy discussion.

7. All humans must be equal before the law, and everyone must have equal rights and freedoms without discrimination.

Explanation: How is this possible when some have judicial immunity?

8. Everyone has the right to a fair and impartial trial by an independent court.

Explanation: When the jury does not know the criminal law, and their opinion and decision are based solely on what the prosecutor and defense lawyer say, it could be said that justice is being compromised, although I still confirm that this is a good law.

9. No one should be discriminated against because of their beliefs, nationality, or ethnicity.

Explanation: We still have racism, and until this problem is solved, this clause of the human rights law will not be implemented, in addition to the explanations I gave above.

10. Everyone has the right to respect for their privacy.

Explanation: This is correct, although it needs more discussion and examination.

11. Everyone as a citizen has the right to access membership in their government.

Explanation: We must ask ourselves, when political parties do not defend us and there is no sponsor for individuals who do not have political parties' dependency, how can this law be enforced?

12. Everyone has the right to access a sufficient standard of living for themselves and their families.

Explanation: This is a very good law, but considering the problems that we have not provided a solution for, such as collecting taxes and selling land by municipalities and other issues such as astronomical salaries for most athletes and artists, this law needs more reflection, serious work, and examination.

13. Everyone has the right to access educational opportunities.

Explanation: When there are nurseries, schools up to high school, and private universities, the lack of access to education from the beginning point of these human rights is considered a violation of human rights.

14. Everyone has the right to seek asylum and protection to preserve their rights.

Explanation: Does seeking asylum under certain laws sometimes cause insecurity?

15. Everyone has the right to join collective and community organizations.

Explanation: The minimum human rights should be implemented in their true sense, and there should be no need for gatherings and organizations unless they are a political game to present governments in a good light.

16. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression and access to information.

Explanation: Behind this law, which is certainly excellent, there are some issues that have not been addressed, such as the fact that excessive freedom leads society astray, especially in rumors and superstitions on social networks, where a form of gender slavery can also be seen.

17. Everyone has the right to freedom of religion and belief.

Explanation: Yes, of course, this is correct.

18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

Explanation: There is room for debate here, but to be brief, I would like to mention that thought should be separated from choice or coercion. We will only have real freedom of thought when there is reasoning behind it, which we do not see as a minimum.

19. Everyone has the right to freedom of religious belief and practice.

Explanation: This section is the same as sections 18 and 17.

20. Everyone has the right to freedom of assembly and association.

Explanation: Gatherings are also like "criticism," which should lead to improvement, not just gatherings based on idle thoughts. But overall, it is a good law.

21. Everyone has the right to access participation in their own government.

Explanation: I have given a similar explanation in paragraph 11.

22. Everyone has the right to access humane working conditions and fair labor rights.

Explanation: As explained in paragraph 12, this law is not enforced.

23. Everyone has the right to access a healthy and hygienic standard of living.

Explanation: The level of income and welfare of the people and, of course, the amount of activity during the week determine whether they have access to such a healthy and hygienic standard of living or not.

24. Everyone has the right to possess arms. (This part is unclear or may be due to translation error).

Explanation: This is a controversial issue and varies from country to country.

25. Everyone has the right to access justice and legal freedoms.

Explanation: Justice is a beautiful word that remains hidden under an umbrella of political laws.

26. Everyone has the right to develop their own cultural identity and access other cultures.

Explanation: This is a very beautiful law.

27. Everyone has the right to access science and technology.

Explanation: When there are various universities and schools, justice in accessing science and technology becomes meaningless.

28. Everyone has the right to access and preserve their own culture and community.

Explanation: It is debatable, but it is a good law.

29. Everyone has the right to access the freedoms that are in place to protect human rights and the freedoms of others.

Explanation: This also goes back to the fact that human rights must be correct and individual freedoms must be meaningful, otherwise, as I mentioned in the above paragraphs, even terrorists have the right to freedom to slaughter people because they are also human and can use human rights.

30. "Everyone has the right to access the rights and freedoms expressed in this book, equally with everyone else."

Explanation: Access to the human rights and freedoms mentioned in the book on human rights requires the fulfillment of the conditions mentioned above, and until they are achieved, having access to them or not will not solve the problem. In order to enforce human rights laws, we need to be decisive, and in my opinion, if we are supposed to truly have human rights, then the management of the human rights department must be completely separate from politics.

Individuals who are not subject to political influence should be selected to judge as fairly as possible.

A powerful enforcement agency is also needed to compel countries to comply with the provisions of the human rights law, rather than just condemn them.

Separating the human rights organization from politics is essential because with the results we have seen in the past few years, it can be said that human rights have played a greater role in condemning than enforcing the law, which is not correct and is also a violation of human rights, as human rights are not just laws that we need to know, but they must be quickly reviewed and immediately implemented. Every time a country or organization is condemned to

be reviewed for human rights laws, many people are tortured and killed, and this is also a violation of human rights. Let's admit that we still have a long way to go in terms of real human rights.

To find the best solution for the issues discussed, we need to approach the topic comprehensively and find the best solution based on the existing conditions and constraints.

To achieve this, we can use various methods such as research, data collection, consultation with experts and relevant specialists, discussion and analysis with others, and past experiences.

Furthermore, to find the best solution, we need to focus on the overall objectives and principles of the issue and keep in mind that the ultimate goal of the solution should be to satisfy people and protect human rights. In this regard, it is important to note that the best solution is not always the best solution for everyone, and we need to consider the different needs of individuals and groups.

In general, to find the best solution for the issues discussed, we should not just rely on research and data collection, consultation with experts and relevant specialists, discussion and analysis with others, and past experiences, but also consider all aspects of the issue and find a suitable solution based on the existing conditions and constraints.

The strategy of introducing philosophy into the subject of human rights laws can play an important role in understanding and promoting human rights. Philosophy, as a research and intellectual field, helps us find the best approach to preserving human rights. For example, philosophy can help us pursue principles such as justice, equality, and freedom in preserving human rights. Moreover, with the introduction of philosophy into the subject of human rights, we can find the best practical methods for preserving human rights.

For example, philosophy can help us find the best methods for resolving conflicts and disputes in preserving human rights.

The strategy of introducing philosophy into the subject of human rights laws can help us find the best solutions and approaches to preserving human rights and reach more accurate conclusions in this regard.

Philosophy's opinion about the ideal society:

The philosophical view on an ideal society has been presented based on various perspectives. Some philosophers regard an ideal society as one that fully provides values such as justice, equality, freedom, and peace.

This society has a system that is designed in a way that individuals fully enjoy their rights and fulfill their responsibilities properly.

Others consider an ideal society as a philosophical approach that does not exist in the real world and perceive it as an unattainable goal. They believe that no society can fully respond to all opinions, beliefs, needs and desires of individuals.

In conclusion, the philosophical view on an ideal society is very dynamic and multifaceted and depends on the different perspectives and theories of philosophers. However, according to the beliefs of many philosophers, an ideal society can be considered as an achievable goal in society that can be achieved by the efforts and collaboration of individuals. Philosophy, as one of the higher levels of human thought, can significantly contribute to the improvement of human rights laws worldwide.

Philosophy can provide a better understanding of the principles and concepts of human rights and examine complex issues based on philosophical approaches. This philosophical approach enables the global community to have a better understanding of what is

necessary to preserve human rights and to propose the best methods and solutions to reform human rights laws worldwide.

By entering human rights laws, philosophy can play an important role in improving and reforming them. By using philosophical methods, we can address issues such as the definition of human rights, the foundations of human rights, and their principles. Additionally, philosophy can help us find the best solutions and approaches to pursue and preserve human rights.

For example, philosophy can help us find the best ways to resolve disputes in preserving human rights. Although the entry of philosophy into the field of human rights laws can significantly help in improving and optimizing these laws, the most important step in this regard is the global community's effort to accept and implement human rights laws.

However, philosophy can help us find the best solutions and approaches to reform human rights laws worldwide and pursue principles such as justice, equality, and freedom in preserving human rights. Therefore, the global community must pay attention to the importance of philosophy's entry into human rights laws and, using philosophical perspectives, strive to improve and optimize human rights laws worldwide. As a result of the participation of philosophy and the efforts of the global community, we can achieve the highest level of protection of human rights worldwide.

Finally, by entering philosophy into human rights laws, we can benefit from previous experiences and the theories of philosophers to improve and reform human rights laws. For this reason, the global community must accept philosophy as a serious solution to uphold human rights.

Explaining culture and its role in human rights:

Culture refers to the values, beliefs, customs, arts, literature, sciences and knowledge, behaviors, and ways of life of a society or a nation. Culture can refer as a collective term to describe anything from symbols and signs to ways of life and social behaviors.

The description of culture means the interpretation and analysis of the cultural content of a particular society. Culture description includes the analysis and examination of concepts, values, beliefs, ways of life, and social behaviors of people in a specific community. This description and interpretation are usually done through literature, art, social sciences, and field research.

The description of culture can help us better understand the culture of a society and gain a better understanding of their values and beliefs. Additionally, a better understanding of culture can aid in the process of intercultural communication and increase positive interactions between different communities. Developing human rights laws in the face of the many cultures in the world poses challenges. These challenges may include cultural and religious differences, varying societal needs, and political and economic disparities.

Generally, developing human rights laws in the world requires cooperation and interaction between different countries and communities. To achieve this, we need to strive to become familiar with different cultures in the world and gain a better understanding of their needs and challenges.

Furthermore, developing human rights laws in the world requires an effective and rational approach.

For example, we need to design human rights laws based on the realities and needs of different societies. Additionally, we should try to create greater awareness and understanding of human rights in different communities through methods such as advocacy, education,

and research. Developing human rights laws in the world requires attention to different cultures and efforts to promote cooperation and interaction between communities. By following these suggestions, we can improve and develop human rights laws in the world.

Philosophers play an important role in creating a balance between different cultures and developing useful and realistic human rights laws. In this regard, philosophers can help by analyzing and studying the concepts and values in different cultures to gain a deeper understanding of the needs and issues of different societies.

Philosophers can contribute to the development of human rights laws in the world through their thoughts and theories. They can help to develop a framework for the development of human rights laws in the world by examining the concepts and values of human rights.

Additionally, philosophers can help to identify the strengths and weaknesses of different human rights laws through analysis and study. In general, philosophers can create a bridge for communication and interaction between different cultures by asking questions and conducting deep analysis. They can help develop human rights laws in the world by taking into account the concepts, values, and needs of different countries and societies.

Therefore, philosophers can contribute to the development of human rights laws in the world by analyzing and studying cultural concepts and values, and by helping to create a balance between different cultures and develop useful and realistic human rights laws.

Despite numerous efforts around the world to develop human rights laws, some countries are still not committed to respecting human rights.

In some cases, the fundamental rights of individuals are trampled on by governments that operate internationally with impunity, and the international community is powerless to put an end to it.

Therefore, it is advisable that philosophers and social experts guide different governments in this regard and help to reform human rights laws in these countries.

Additionally, the United Nations should make its strongest efforts to enforce human rights laws.

Given the lack of respect for human rights in some countries, it is recommended that the United Nations be empowered to expel countries that do not adhere to human rights from membership.

This action can be considered as a humiliation for countries that do not respect human rights and need to be pressured to achieve the goals of human rights in the world.

As a result, to reform human rights laws and enable the United Nations to expel countries that do not adhere to human rights from membership.

This action can help achieve the goals of human rights in the world and put an end to the lack of respect for human rights.

These recommendations are based solely on the expertise and knowledge of philosophers and social experts in the field of human rights, and there is no intention of insulting or demeaning countries or governments that do not adhere to human rights.

Given that respect for human rights is one of the most fundamental human values, it is recommended that governments and international organizations cooperate and coordinate with each other to enforce human rights.

Therefore, the aim of these recommendations is to improve the status of human rights worldwide, and there is no intent to offend anyone.

Given the limitations that governments and international organizations face in enforcing human rights, it is recommended that greater efforts be made to improve the status of human rights

worldwide. In addition, it is recommended that philosophers and social experts play a crucial role in analyzing and examining various cultural concepts and values in different societies regarding human rights. Such analyses can lead to a better understanding of human rights issues in different societies and have a significant impact on improving the status of human rights globally.

Overall, improving the status of human rights worldwide requires cooperation and joint efforts among governments, international organizations, and experts with United Nations. In this regard, the role of philosophers and social experts in analyzing and examining human rights-related issues is crucial and can contribute to improving the situation in this area.

"Providing recommendations for global integration and improving the human rights situation around the world, responding to the main needs of the international community as well as fundamental changes and raising the level of authority of the United Nations.

In ancient times, we had different lands, but today we have a planet called Earth, which only has different cultures, and to enter the new arena, it is necessary that the powers of the United Nations be increased in executive matters, and of course decisively.

Please wait for me to present some suggestions to the United Nations in a comprehensive article.

Some of it has been prepared, but I think it needs more consultation with my colleagues."

I sincerely thank you for your attention and I hope that this review will be useful and allow us to be able to serve the international community and the future generation of mankind honestly.